

the development of specific biological weapons. As to whether their advice is helpful, as to whether the Committee is having any influence *unfortunately* this is a question you'll have to ask me a couple of years from now about the time my tenure on the Committee is over because I simply don't know now. Again perhaps Dr. Romig who has been on the Committee longer can answer that.

Starting out to make up some notes for this meeting I tried to start at the beginning and examine the general question of the relation of the individual and the Society to biological warfare and I came up with some very simple questions. They may seem simpleminded but I don't think the answers to them are at all simple. We could start out from the very beginning and what is the involvement of the individual microbiologist in biological warfare. Involvement is a very popular word now. I wonder if ~~we're~~ ^{I was} using it correctly so I looked it up in the dictionary. I think I am because the definition of to involve" is "to draw in ^{as} a participant." I think this is what we're talking about. ^{Well} ~~Where~~ ^{general} we have involvements as human beings its because we are microbiologists and scientists and we can't forget that we're still human beings. We have special professional involvements as microbiologists. Because by virtue of his professional training, microbiologists should ^{be} ~~be~~ better able than most to evaluate the pros and cons of biological warfare. I wonder how seriously we take this responsibility. ^{how much homework} For example ^{how much homework} have we done? How many of you here have read Gen. Rothschild's book? How many of you have read ^{Hedeen's} review in the Annual Review of Microbiology? This is a horrible thing to tell to an author, but I had ^{not} ~~had~~ read your book ^{until} ~~a~~ a few weeks ago. I got it out of the University Library and I could tell by the charge card that I'm the only person that had taken it out of the library. I don't think this is an indictment of Gen. Rothschild's book. I think it is an indictment of the scholarly

community at the University of Chicago that takes no more interest in the subject than to try to get at some of the basic facts. *All right I'll leave that one*

The second thing is he has a special involvement because it is the application of his research and the research of his colleagues both present and past that makes biological warfare possible. I think few of us ~~inxxxx~~ are in any position to disavow this, ^{to} say but my research has nothing to do with biological warfare. I think almost all microbiological research has something to do with biological warfare because unfortunately all the problems of biological warfare ^{are} ~~and~~ intertwined in a very complex way with the problems of understanding and controlling infectious disease. The most fundamental answers in microbiological are likely to be the ones with the most unsettling consequences. It has always been a pet ~~xxxx~~ thesis ~~xxxxxxx~~ of mine that the great recent advances in biology and ~~xxx~~ microbiology are not in any way being applied to understand ^{any?} ~~an~~ infectious disease. That ~~is~~, ^{if} for example, we really wanted to make a major effort we should be able to come up with the genetic basis of virulence. And the possibilities of what would happen if we did make this ~~sort of~~ effort are the sort of things that Dr. Lederberg was talking about earlier this afternoon.

The second thing that we really ought to examine is as microbiologists what is the real range of our attitudes towards biological weapons. *Heden* in his review points out that there is what he calls a distribution of attitudes towards ~~the~~ weapons. He contrasts the two sides: those who feel biological weapons ^{of} are the most humane of all and those are filled with the moral indignation and repugnance at their very mention. Of course inbetween there is a middle ground ^{of opinion} ~~that~~ depends on all sorts of judgments. To name only one, how much research and development is needed for preparedness against biological warfare. One ~~could~~ go on and on. I suspect we have a rather disjointed spectrum of opinions about biological warfare and about ⁱⁿ different questions about biological warfare. *I'll come back to the*

importance of this in a minute. Then we have to ask ourselves the question ^{as individuals} what can we do about it as individuals. We could ignore it. I find that hard to do with an easy conscience. I assume simply by your presence here this afternoon you are of the same opinion. You wouldn't be here otherwise. But I feel a great many people who shouldn't be ignorigg the question are ignoring it. The second thing he could try to do something about it. But we all know that it is fruitless and frustrating to have views and opinions on something if we can't make these views and opinions ⁱⁿ known some effective way. Unless a microbiologist ^{which few of us are} is a particularly eminent person he is very unlikely to have any influence ~~at~~ at all on policies governing preparation for biological warfare.

That brings us inevitably to the real question. That is what is the ^{involvement} society ~~is involved~~. As the only broadly based ^{micro} biological society in this country its involvement in a sense is ~~the~~ collective involvement of all its members. It can't ignore biological warfare and all the problems and issues that come with it any more than its individual members can. But it has equally difficult and somewhat different problems in doing something about it. Then we come to what can the ASM do about biological warfare. What are the problems in the Society taking action? The question of whether any free ^{society?} Society whether it be a scientific society or a University or so forth should take ^a collective position on any issue. That is should the Society's stand on any issue be determined by majority vote? This ^{as you remember} Question was brought up last spring at our general business meeting. Can this be done without violating the rights of the ^{dissenting} minorities. ^{At} The University of Chicago we have had a long and continuing discussion of this. Can a University take a stand on an issue or not? There is no answer to it. Then one could ask is any unanimous collective position on biological ^{policy} warfare ^{I don't know, we'll just have to find out.} possible? Let us say suppose ^{no} a collective position is possible.

Can the ASM

5

Can the ASM ask ^a the Society still influence biological ^[warfare] policy, how?
I think one clear ^{way} play is to foster and stimulate open discussion such
as this. ^{Beyond that} I don't know. One would then ask is the presently constituted
Advisory Committee the proper instrument for this Society to influence
policy. Then we come to such questions, and I know this will influence
a lot of your minds, is the existence of the present committee to be
interpreted as a collective action endorsing the present biological
warfare policy or is it a collective action acknowledging the existence
of biological warfare potentiality and the inevitable involvement of
any microbiological society with these problems.

^{There's one good} A quotation from Gen. Rothschild's book ^{from a trial of our Maxon} for the Harvard Crimson
in which the question is brought up "Does contemplation of a catastrophe
necessarily mean ^{advocation} education of it?" I think this is part of the question.

Finally, what are the alternatives? What can the Society do?
First it can retain the Committee at its present level of function, ^{but} I
would suspect this would mean no real policy role for the ASM. Give me
two years and I'll give my real opinion on it; this is a prediction.
I don't see how as presently constituted with all due respects to present
and past members how it is likely to influence policy very much if for no
other reason than it has no place to feed in any opinions it might have.
We could discharge the Committee and take no other action. I think this
would not hurt the biological warfare effort at all because I believe
there is no doubt that they could independently of society get the same
once a year expert opinion even from the same people that they did before.
If no other is taken then the society is ignoring all the questions and
the problems relating to biological warfare. ^{How} Mr. Galbraith would say we
will have lost contact. It is necessary for the Society to decide whether
it wants to lose contact. ^{and} We could expand the present Committee function
to include policy, but how? ^{I don't know} We could set up some other instrument or ASM
action against what instrument and how would it work?

I want to end with what you could call an exhortation. Let's look at the situation in the broadest possible context. The Advisory Committee of the ASM is not the problem. It is merely the instrument that is served to remind us of our own personal involvement as scientists, microbiologists, as persons, the involvement of the Society in all the problems arising from the clear possibility of infectious agents being used as weapons. The real problem is what to do about this involvement. This involvement is going to stay with us whether you keep the Committee, whether we change it, or whether we do away with it entirely.

Dr. Romig:

In the ~~main~~ main I would agree with what he said. I think it was overstated just a little bit that our Committee members do not have any feed in at all. I'd say that we don't have the amount of feed in that one would like to have. For instance, the Committee writes a report to ~~formerly~~ it was a commanding General of Edgewood Arsenal and now it is to the scientific director of Fort Detrick since some type of administrative reorganization went on. I had explained to me in great detail ~~that~~ at one meeting of about 40 different organization lines that I have forgotten. The report is submitted ^{and} is read because occasionally some of the very specific types of recommendations are acted upon. But the type that I'm referring to now are more procedural types of recommendations. At least the report is read but whether broader ^{aspects that} have been written upon are acted upon, again I don't know.

Panel discussion:

Dr. Marr:

A question Dr. Romig: with in the bounds of security is it possible to provide us with some examples of the sorts of magnums on which the ^{matter}

Committee gives its advice now to the civilian director of the Army Biological Laboratories?

DR. Romig:

As Dr. Moulder pointed out, the major ^{part} of the advice that is given ^{Now that's the major part of the advice that's} are specific questions from laboratory scientists. There is a group ^{given} ^{to get personnel about, scientists to what I know} that works on B. subtilus and the phages of the B. subtilus and I happen to be acquainted with some of those problems. And the major part of my time at Fort Detrick is discussing the day-to-day problems ~~that~~ talking over the research that they have done. I'm sure that is ~~that~~ so of the other members of the panel. ^{talk} that go back there to give help to the people at Fort Detrick depending on your area of interest and presumed expertise that you are shunted off to one or another ^{of the} lab in which you would be interested in talking ^{with} about. But now additionally to that there are almost always is a presentation by one of the branchchiefs on the work, the literal overall work that is ^{being} done at that particular branch, and occasionally that would be security type material in the sense that before the talk starts you are specifically told that this comes under security ^{review}. The other type of talk we have they let you know that there is no security involved at all. But there are certain very firmly distinct areas ~~in~~ in which you are told that this is a security area. Of course that either does, or potentially would have something to do with the weaponry of biological warfare. ^{Either does, or potentially, or at least they think it does.}

Dr. Marr:

Does the annual report to the civilian director concern itself primarily with the kind of questions you put in the first category, scientific advice not subject to security or does it concern itself primarily with the second category, those aspect of policy or items which are for one reason or another in the category of security?

Dr. Romig:

Dr. Romig:

I'd say it is fairly well mixed. Some of the committees before I was appointed to this particular committee, for instance, pointed out that they felt that the level of intensity of effort there was much below what it should be. Whether or not they thought what they were being hired to do they were doing well. ~~Whether or not they thought what they were being hired to do they were doing well.~~ Other reports would consider whether a particular area is represented in depth as one thinks it should it. For instance certain physiological areas were considered weak and that they should be strengthened. Now those would be more policytype of decisions. Other things that are carried into the report is the fact that there ^{was} ~~is~~ not an electron ^{microscope} available in a particular area in which its use certainly was indicated and it was specifically requested that for this type of research ^{to have any meaning} ~~they have a need for~~ an electron ^{would be useful} microscope. I would like to sum it up by saying the report contains any kind of information that the Committee thinks would be useful to the commanding General or to the scientific director and which if acted upon would make the scientific ^{effort} more useful there at Fort Detrick.

Question: Dr. Allen G. Mann

Do you feel that the existence of this Committee implies approbation by the national organization of ASM on the activities carried out by the Army Biological Laboratory? Do you think there is implicit in the Committee approbation by the National ASM?

Dr. Romig: You want just my personal opinion? Dr. Mann: { Well through your experience on the Comm. or from your own personal views concerning the Society

Through my experience on the Committee I didn't notice ~~any~~ data to relate ^{ing} to that. I have gotten an impression that the existence of the Committee through the ASM does have an official sanction for Fort Detrick, somewhat similar to what Dr. Moulder said, and some of my

colleagues at UCLA, that the two were somewhat ~~was~~ linked together, but I didn't get that thing necessarily from the work I've done on Dr. Rothschild: the Committee

Gen
~~Dr.~~ Rothschild:

I would just like to make one ~~Agmment~~ ^{Agmment} so my credibility doesn't seem to be too badly damaged. Dr. Moulder mentinned that they met once a year with the Chemical Corps. When I was speaking of our ^{civilian} scientific advising committees, I was not only ^{referring to} speaking of the Advisory Committee of the ASM. We have other civilian advisory committees which meet much more often than that.

Question: Dr. A.J. Clark

do
How are those constituted and how ~~xxx~~ those committees stack up in importance to the research and development effort ^{vis a vis} the ASM Committee?
Dr. Rothschild:

I believe those committees are selected in conjunction ^{probably through} with consultation with well-known scientists and institutions outside. But I think they are designated by the approach ^{and} and then after acceptance designated by the Chemical Corps ^{at Detrick}.

Some of these committees meet alot more often. But it is not only the committee meeting. For instance one of our major committees, I forget what the title ^{now} ~~is~~, met about every other month. But they would get the members of the committee in to consult with our workers in their field of particular qualification. So they saw them more often than the regular meetings of the committee. They would come in for general briefings at least ^{I think,} these every-other-month meetings.

Question: Dr. A.J. Clark

Would you consider that their activities were crucial for the functioning ^{of} ~~for~~ the research and development?

Dr. Rothschild:

Very definitely.

Question: Dr. A.J. Clark

To Dr. Moulder and Dr. Romig: do you consider that the function of the

Advisory Committee are equally crucial to the research and development efforts of the Army? in chemical and biological warfare?

Dr. Moulder:

I would say that if it is to function as an expert advisory committee and do it efficiently, it would have to have more contact ^{than it does} with .
I have had some experience consulting with the Chemical Corps, and with industrial firms. If you are going to be an effective consultant you ^{have} ~~are~~ ~~going to have~~ to concern yourself with a fairly small area and get to know the people involved and the program. I think what the ASM committee is getting is a sort of ^a general overall view. I don't believe that more than that can be gotten in a once-a-year visit. *I repeat this a statement of a Chairman who is yet to meet with his Committee.*
Question: *Gen Rothschild?*

Is this a function of the desires of the ASM committee or Detrick?

Dr. Moulder:

I don't know. Probably more of the Committee.

Dr. Romig:

^ Going back there once a year isn't an ~~onerous~~ onerous task. They have all kinds of trouble as Dr. Moulder probably knows ~~they are~~ ^{xxxx} ~~assigning~~ ^s one date a year and I don't know what you would do if you had to do that every month. If it were going to be done effectively, I have been back now a total of five days in three years and I don't probably know anything more about biological warfare than Dr. Moulder does since he has read the book. Detrick has several hundred Ph.D.'s. I did read ~~an annual~~ ^{the} review. ^{in the Annual Review} And it is a very large operation and you just can't learn that operation in a day and a half ~~in~~ a year. Since I'm not terrifically interested in biological warfare ^{I mean}, that is not why I'm on the Committee. I wasn't selected because I was interested in it or knew anything about it--I didn't and I still don't know very much. But in a day and a half a year you just can't learn ^{Actually} too much about it. Exactly at the other end of the microscope we spend two-

thirds of the time at least working with one group--the genetics group in my case, and that in itself tends to limit your overall view of what's going on. Although they do make an effort to have a briefing of the entire committee at least once a year on ^{one} ~~the~~ segment but I haven't been on it long enough to get the entire picture yet and I forget from one year to the next the details ^{of what} ~~was~~ given. So I would say it is of ~~limited~~ usefulness since you can't do ^{that} ~~the~~ kind of ^a job you do for an industrial firm unless you meet very often.

Question: Dr. Allen G. Marr.

This might be a delicate matter and I don't mean to be indelicate at all.
The method of selection of the membership of the Committee, I mean in a formal sense, not how specific individuals were chosen as a member of the committee as opposed to six other people. But what is the policy of selection of membership of the Committee Advisory to the Army Biological Laboratory ^{within} ~~in~~ our Society?

Dr. Moulder:

It is the same as all committees. The president-elect of the Society ^{Dennis Watson asked me} ~~asks~~ the chairman of the committee for nominations for the committee. I understand that in the past that these nominees have been selected by the ~~ask~~ chairman of the committee in consultation with the scientific director at Fort Detrick. These names are then sent to the president-elect who appoints all the committees and from this list he gets new members of the committee just as in other committees done by regular Society action. Most committees are essentially self-perpetuating.

Question: Dr. Allen G. Marr.

May I ask if you get any experience, the degree to which the director of the Army Biological Laboratory participates in the selection of Committee members?

Dr. Moulder: *You would have to ask Dr. Romig that. I have not got that experience.*
Dr. Romig: *I could tell you that after the 28th of November.*

One year he was fairly well involved, ^{since} ~~he~~ was also president of the Society. But my recollection is that during that year he did not make any

appointments because of the fact that he didn't ~~have~~ the propriety involved.

Dr. Moulder:

It is my guess he would leave this up to the Society knowing Dr.
as a person I can't conceive of ^{him} trying to influence the Committee.

Dr. Romig:

No, it is pretty much up to the Committee.

Question from the floor:

and it seems to me obvious from what has been said that
The question has been raised on the constitution of the committee. One character-
must
istic of the members of the committee ~~don't~~ share that ~~that~~ distinguish
them from all other committees of the Society, however those other committees
? this committee is composed of microbiologists who have
a security clearance *This leaves out the portion of* microbiologists in the
country who for whatever reason ~~xx~~ can't get a security clearance. This
sufficient
reason alone is a ~~definite~~ one to urge the disengagement of the Society
from this kind of activity.

Dr. Moulder?

Would you urge complete disengagement or would you urge a different ~~xx~~
sort of Society Committee?

Questioner:

Given the ways ~~how~~ a scientific society ^{is} constructive in this
country, that is viewing the ASM as the kind of organization that ?
the business of propagating microbiology, running an annual meeting,
publishing a journal, and recognizing how ~~it's~~ ⁱⁿ effectiveness it is
in most basic discussion of political issues I would recommend complete
~~disengagement~~ disengagement of the Society from this business.

Dr. Moulder:

was bringing
I would ~~bring~~ up another point. I wouldn't look to the Academy of
Microbiology for stepping into the vacuum. It would be particularly
ineffective in doing it. I think if microbiologists are going to in any way
influence public policy through ^a ~~its~~ society its going to have to be the ASM

because it is the really only effective broadly representative microbiological society.

Dr. Clark:

I think there is a disagreement here, and I think that the disagreement stems on whether the Society should be responsible to the Army in this kind of relationship whether it has an advisory committee or a committee by some other name or whether its responsibility ought to be directed elsewhere. Perhaps to the scientific community as a whole or perhaps to the public or to some other agency ~~rather~~ than the US Army.

Dr. Moulder:

I've raised the question of other types of involvement completely broadly without any restrictions.

Dr. Clark:

May I take the Chair's prerogative to point ~~at~~ out at this point that there is I think one other difference between this committee and other committees of the ASM. It is connected with the security clearance *aspect*. That is I believe that there is no other committee of the ASM which does not report its conclusions of its deliberations to the Society. This committee as I understand it reports to the technical director of Fort Detrick and does not report its conclusions to the Society and I would point this out as being one major difference.

Dr. Moulder:

A report is written about the committee's activities that goes into the Newsletter.

Dr. Clark:

Yes but the conclusions of its deliberations are not publicised to the Society.

Dr. Moulder:

Yes, this is true. Let me phrase another question. This has been

suggested to me, it is not original. Suppose a committee could be constituted in which the question of security clearance did not arise.

Suppose it could be constituted in such a way that the committee did

not have to have a security clearance and the committee could make a full report of what it did.

Dr. Clark Advisory to the army. *Dr. Moulder: I don't claim any originality for that.* What is your reaction to that? *You would have to spell out the details of how this was done*

Questioner: My reaction to it would be highly desirable and in a sense practical ~~but~~ impossible.

I would assume that a committee like this simply would simply not have access to anything of any interest to Fort Detrick. *in the first instance* *You're talking about a hypothetical situation which is so hypothetical as to be disinteresting.*

Dr. Clark: what I think you're driving at

To rephrase, would such a committee be acceptable to Fort Detrick?

Have you any information on that?

Dr. Moulder:

merely bring I brought it up without any strings attached. I wanted to see ~~xxx~~ *what I think about* how people react to this.

Questioner:

Are there any other committees of the ASM which are in ~~xxx~~ effect vetoed as to their composition by an outside agency? -

Dr. Moulder:

No. I'm pretty sure this is the only one.

Questioner:

The important thing is not whether or not the Committee has any substantive effect on the operation of Fort Detrick but what the editor of the Chicago

Maroon thinks it does because that is the image and it seems to me that

by admitting there is no way to communicate the fact that is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Is there any reason for the membership of the Society to transmit their own view to the committee so that *any formal means for doing this or impossibility of setting it up* the committee will be ~~xxxxxxx~~

to the membership of the Society as a pipeline

Dr. Moulder:

I presume the proper way to act is as this branch did last spring. I mean instruct its counselor to the council to bring up any matter ~~it~~ it desires to do. ~~so~~ This is the appropriate way of action. I think bringing up anything individually or on the floor of a general business meeting is likely not to get anywhere. The power structure of this society is through the Council. So I think if you are really going to do anything you have to ~~work with~~ ^{work through} the council. Where you start is at local meetings like this. That's why I'm here ~~because~~ ^{although I} ~~all~~ may not agree with all of you ~~I think~~ ^{that this is the} constructive way to go about finding out what we really want to do about it. I don't think it has ever been discussed before.

Question:

it is ^{not} our ~~that our opinion of Fort~~
~~xxxx~~ opinion ~~is not what~~ Detrick wants. it is just basic information

I think the committee ^{if it is being honest with itself, I mean we}
^{could give all our opinions to the Committee but Fort}
^{Detrick has no interest in us. What they want is what}
[?]

Dr. Moulder: It seems to me from one of the comments made by Dr. Moulder about the responsibility of the Society and involvement. The concern of ? and of SDS and of us on matters of public policy with respect to BW it doesn't fit at all with the committee whose functions are those we heard described by the Chairman and the members of the committee. It seems ~~xxx~~ to me ^{does} that the existence of this committee ~~xxxx~~ indeed conveys a sense of approbation by the Society on these activities and that the committee structured as it is and reporting to the persons to whom it reports offers no real possibilities even if we were to communicate with our committee of alternate public policy. It is the wrong level in my opinion.

Dr. Clark:

Could you suggest a level upon which the Society might work to alter public policy?

~~Questioner:~~ Dr. Marr

It seems to me that we are suggesting that the Society should have ~~an intact relation with~~ ^{impact at the level of} the National Security-Council. By some means. But the trickle-up philosophy of making public policy is a very ~~unworkable~~ ^{one in my opinion}

Dr. Moulder:

This is what I was talking about when I said we didn't have any feed in here. Anyone familiar with the military hierarchy, there are as many layers as there are peels on an onion. You can get completely frustrated in trying to work your way up. I think one thing ~~ix~~ might be possible and I did bring that up. Is any statement on policy possible by the Society? Can anyone come up with a statement that the Society is willing to back? This has never been explored before.

Dr. Clark:

Dr. Lederberg raised an issue which I will use my prerogative to ^{bring} up at this point and that is the question of whether the Society can take a policy stand is not particularly appropriate. The point is can it take an initiative to insure control and to insure the publication ~~of~~ or information access by the scientific community to the activities of the research and development on biological warfare. I don't believe that any such initiative through the aiding of private groups such as the Pugwash conference or through the medium of the publicity such as the Annual Reviews of Microbiology that I don't believe that such activities by the Committee would constitute a policy position.

Questioner: [?] ~~at~~ [?] I think it is least conceivable that we could urge ^{Councilor} upon our ~~Council~~ to be presented at the national meeting the essence of the policy that Dr. Lederberg is urging, ^{namely} ~~that~~ why should the Society use ^{the proper exercise of} scientific activity as resulting only in the publication of the information that is learned. And ^{that we} would therefore give no sanction to

activities that require secrecy and security clearances and this would involve the abolition of this particular committee. And we would urge that the matter of public policy of biological warfare in the area in which this Society has some expertise using this area of professional competence that this be subject to changes in the legal structure that would permit complete publication of all the ? of Fort Detrick. I don't think that this as a policy matter is something that the organization couldn't grapple with. I'm pessimistic about what the outcome would be. I think it is a reasonable thing to urge upon our councillor to defend at the business meeting.

Dr. Wyatt:

I would like to suggest that maybe the Society would perhaps be amenable to ^a diametrically opposed point of view as regards the Committee than you have but which might also serve the purposes that you proposes and Dr. lederberg mentioned much better. It seems at this time through some strange set of circumstances that this Society is unique in having such a committee. This committee is potentially a very powerful means for the membership expressing their feelings. Now we nominate senators and representatives to Congress. They all have security clearances. I don't think it bothers us that they have to have security clearances. They get them even if they're not really clearable but they usually are and they are very carefully watched in this regard. All of our representatives ^v in very high offices in this country have security clearances. The ~~main~~ problems of security I think in biological warfare are really misinterpreted. The main problems are those of intelligence, weapon deployment, and things that are not of immediate interest to microbiologists. For microbiologists, for me at least, are what the impacts on civilization of this type of thinking. How can we influence it? Why not instruct a Committee made up of hawks and doves namely people who feel that this is a terrible type of a thing to have but nevertheless

they are going to be on that Advisory Committee--that word "advisory" is kind of bad, call it a directive type of committee. On this committee, everyone has their security clearance, but there are people who are opposed to biological warfare very strongly on it, those who are in favor on it, and this Committee is available to the Army for advice and also consent perhaps. If the Army does not wish to accept the recommendations of the committee or include them in their confidence I think the Society is big enough and powerful enough to put pressure on the Army to listen to this committee. I think the Army has a Trojan horse. If the Committee is given a little more power by the membership of the ASM this Committee may well

serve everybody's purposes. I can say that 90% of the deliberations of the Army could easily be published. The ^{little} small fraction of ^{highly} classified information that is kept from the Committee is of really I think no interest. But the Committee can be a very powerful tool and I think before the Society abandons it ^{it} they ought to think of using it to promote their point of view. The Army has made a commitment, ^{Now} the Society has a chance to really put forward its points of view. If we abandon this committee we will never get another such opportunity. I think we can use ^{the Committee} it in a great number of ways if the membership were more actively involved. ^{I would like to hear some remarks for the members of Committee}
Dr. Romig:

In a way I agree with your point of view because as I say the report of the Committee is read, I don't know who reads ^{it, it may be a private somewhere but it is read}, and if the Committee were instructed to pursue a certain policy and that policy were transmitted it might well have whatever effect the Society wanted to ^{was} ?. But it is one way ^{that} the Society's viewpoint ~~thex~~ can be transmitted directly to people who form ^{at least} or partly form policy and do read the report.

Questioner:

I think that there is one point ^{about which} that I could be assured in relation to this question that the ASM committee could have some effect on policy carried out. I think ^{it} might ^{be proof that it had} ? however it seems to me that everything that you have been telling us about what you do ~~x~~ the constitution of the Committee ^{its} mandate the specific relationship ^{to the Fort} precludes this ^{under the current} ^{circumstances} it would have to entail a complete reworking of the agreement and the charge of the Committee. To achieve this I think ^{is} ~~axxx~~ very large question posed to the membership ~~xxxx~~ of the ASM and indeed this would entail a question of whether or not there ^{could} be a ^{reached} consensus by the ASM and whether the ASM should participate in ~~xxxx~~ an attempt to influence policy. ?

Dr. Moulder:

What you are saying is very true. But before we do something we must decide ~~xx~~ what we want to do and I don't think we really know what we want to do as a Society.

Dr. Rothschild:

I have a comment to make. This is of course is not a field of my immediate interest but it seems to me that you should divide your problem up into two areas. One is direct technical contributions to an effort to which the country is involved. This among other things would assist in insuring that some of the things that Dr. Lederberg is worrying about don't happen. Practically all scientific societies, certainly the two ^{American Chemical Society} I belong to the ACS and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers feel that they have responsibility to the public in their area of scientific discipline. I think that this would be a part of the area of responsibility of the ASM. Then I think the other area you're discussing can possibly be solved ~~separately~~ separately from this is whether the Society members feel that the United States should have efforts in ^{a certain} ~~this~~ field. I think they are not necessarily the same effort and not necessarily embodied in the same particular organization in the ASM.

Dr. Clark:

I would like to comment on this. At least the ACS feels that ^{advice} to the Department of Defense is within the ^{purview} of their responsibility ^{to} of the public because they are bound by law to advise the Department of Defense. They are federally chartered. And there are two conditions to that charter. One is that they report to the Congress on their ^{the state of} activities and ~~that on~~ their budget. And the second is that they advise ~~to~~ the Department of Defense on weaponry. I don't know if that is true of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers but I think that the ASM is free of that legal obligation.

Dr. Rothschild: But they wrote their charter. But they have a charter that they wrote and the members of the Society know what to do.
Dr. Clark:

Dr. Rothschild:

I was actually speaking of more than a legal obligation. I was speaking of the social moral obligation of any society ^{that's as widely based as this} and in the particular case I'm speaking of is advice on for example whether you are going in a direction that is ^{inimical} to the interest of the American people ^{as a whole}. In other words the danger of using something that might cause widespread infection, etc. That is separate from whether there should be work going on in the biological warfare field.

Dr. Clark:

Yes of course. But the social responsibility is I think precluded by the legal one in this case. The question is not clear whether the ACS has decided of its own free will ^{one policy of} advice to the Department of Defense or whether that is ~~another~~ policy they have adopted because of their federal charter. ^{Dr. Rothschild: But ASM must be chartered somewhere. Dr. Clark: ASM is not federally chartered} The ASM is a private organization and not chartered by the federal government, and so it has no legal responsibility to the federal government for advice on weapons.

Questioner: ^{Dr.} George Hegeman

It occurs to me that speaking of social or moral obligations that there are branches of the ASM, Mexico and I believe ^{and} Brazil as well, in addition ^{their} international to being a very large membership. It seems to me that we are in a somewhat paradoxical position in advising ~~specifically~~ the US Army with regard to biological weaponry. We might be put in a very ambiguous position if the Mexican Govt. decided through ^{local} their branch to request some help. This is not a nationally chartered organization so far as I know. ^{developing along these lines} but international and it has an independent constitution.

Dr. Clark:

Are there other comments?

Question: Dr. Wyatt

The American ^{Physical} Chemical Society has no such Advisory Committee and look what's happened ^{to nuclear weapons}. Now here's an opportunity for the ASM to do something before it gets to the state that the physicists ? on the biological program.

Dr. Clark:

Actually that analogy is particularly apt I think. The microbiologists find themselves in a very curious and ambiguous position. In a sense they are like physicists prior to 1932 ~~begin~~ continuing work in which they don't the outcome, whether the outcome will make the particular weapons feasible. In a sense they are like the physicists during the WW II working on a Manhattan Project in which the outcome is known in which weapons are being developed and or stockpiled and for potential use. The microbiologists then find themselves with a kind of involvement which is very analogous to the situation of the physicists ^{vis} a vis atomic weapons.

Question: Is it or is it not appropriate at this meeting to try to get a resolution passed, .

Dr. Clark:

It is not appropriate at this meeting.

~~Dr. Clark~~ Question: I think there's one other point which might be mentioned in connection with the suggestion that this policy might be split up a little bit - split up into a policy of technical aspects. You mentioned a reason but an additional reason might be that individuals that you wanted to reach might be the same as with technical and policy advice might actually be different.

Dr. Clark:

I didn't quite catch the relevance of that.

Question:

The point I have in mind is that technical advice would go to the actively working staff of Fort Detrick. I would suppose that if you wanted reactions to suggestions or advice on policy from others than the employed technical staff of Fort Detrick because I would doubt that they have any great amount of policy control, as voice as citizens probably at the moment.

~~Dr. Moulder:~~ Dr. Marr:

I would like to respond briefly to a point made by Dr. Hegeman on the international character ~~involved~~ of our ASM. It seems to me that logically if we accept that as being a ^{substantive matter} ~~that we have an~~ international responsibilities to both branch organizations and other countries ^{and an} international membership in the ASM ^{that} there is no way out short of abolition of the existing committee without establishing any other kind of committee ^{which} engaged ^{itself} in active policy. I think ^{if} ~~that~~ we want to act in such a way as to influence national policy we'll have to ignore the issue of foreign membership in our Society and the foreign branches in our organization. ^{Perhaps that's what we'll choose to do but} ~~that~~ we should face that point ^{that and it} would be by ignoring ~~it~~ altogether the interests of these people.

Question: Dr. Phaff

^{Research} ^{were to have}
If the National Security Council ~~reviewed~~ a committee of this sort, ^{taking} ~~making~~ its membership from the ASM it would avoid the complication of foreign countries. That would not be officially sanctioned by the ASM. But the Pres. of the ASM would make a panel of people available followed by [?]. The Nat'l Research Council would have the obligation to advise the Govt. on [?] ^{seemingly} in the best position to do it than the ASM, a private organization.
Dr. Clark:

Presumably ^{the Army} ^{might seek} ^{to} take such action if this committee were abolished.

Question: Dr. Phaff:

^{of course that}
The only disadvantage of that, is then the ASM except through individual ^{of the organization} members the ASM has no further say ^{or control over what develops} ~~there at Fort Detrick~~. As ^{the Chairman} ~~someone~~ on the Committee has pointed ^{at this point} out this leaves the relations between the Society and what goes on at Fort Detrick although very vague ^{policy-wise}.
Dr. Clark:

Well, I wonder if that is true. ~~Mr~~ Does anyone have any opinions on that. Would the Society have any influence except through ^{this kind of} the Advisory Committee on the research and development of biological weapons ^{on the policy} on the US Army and the government in this area.

-Dr. Moulder:

Probably is the largest single biological Society in the country.
We have something like 10,000 members. I just can't believe that if there is any real unanimity of opinion at any level on these problems that the Society can't come up with some instrument^{by} which in a legitimate fashion it can't influence policy. And I am quite sure as individuals we aren't going to do anything. Our only hope is through the Society and I would like to point out what I said before. If we just give up^{and do it} the easiest way let^{run} the present the Committee ~~right~~ along the way it is or take the next easiest way out and simply discharge out it without any other activity, Our obligation and our involvement is going to remain and we won't be doing anything about it at all. That is certainly what I would hate to see as large and as powerful a society as this simply give^{up} on an issue that's is important to all of us as this is. This is why I would be against dissolving the Committee without concurred^{ant} efforts to replace it without any other instrument of involvement.

Question: Dr. Dimmick

John, It seems that one problem is technical advice and one is policy advice and I think it's ~~not~~ policy advice that's really worrying us. Could it we do ourselves and perhaps in the interest of a favor If we simply kept this committee and left it as a technical advisory

committee and set up our own policy committee which would be elected by the Society and which would make their statements^{forever} available^{in the form} of a yearly report. Whatever policy this Committee would come up with. ^{Easier to} It would change from year to year also

Dr. Marr
admitt

I miss the logic of the division that you and others have spoken of. I cannot understand why the ASM should be the vehicle for providing technical advice. We have been told by several people including members of the current committee that^{that} advice is marginal in terms of the

amount of time spent. We have been told that other advisors, ^{vastly} other scientific advisors spend more time, are more familiar with the ^{technical} details of the operation. I must ask ourselves why there is such a committee. It is apparently not performing as good a function as it could considering the quality of its members. It may have then some other reason for existence apart from ^{simply} essentially providing technical council to the Army Biological Laboratories.

Question: Dr. Dimmick

How about the psychological problem if we take a stand that we will refuse as a Society to furnish technical advice. Regardless of how much you think they might listen to that any policy statements we might make. On the other hand if we take the stand that we will advise the Army technically and at the same time make the policy, this gives ~~us~~ the impression at least that we are trying to be unbiased and fair about the situation as possible.

What you seem to ~~seem to~~ be changing the Committee with and what I understood from other comments on the Committee is that the Committee is to be used as a ^{foil} as a crowbar or some sort of wedge or some lever against the Army. That is that the technical advice or the fact the ASM would be willing to give technical advice would somehow be dependent upon the Army's taking the policy advice of the ASM.

Question: Dr. Dimmick: I'm just saying that they're as human as the rest of us.

If they think they are ^{gaining} getting an edge from this ^{Committee} the information and if you take that edge away from them and any other human might react and ~~steal~~ that ^{they're human,} they are liable to immediately ^{resent} prevent anything else we might say. I don't see any harm in giving the Army technical advice. They're going to get it any way. What's the difference between having this Committee and having them come in and choose persons from the microbiological world to begin with

Dr. Hegeman:

Presuming that some of these proposals which envisage a policy — ^{and} ~~that is promulgating~~ making role are possible, it seems to me there is

still difficulties. First of all the organization is chartered as a non profit organization and by the same fact is restrained from making political actions of any sort.

~~an organization that is chartered~~

~~a nonprofit organization by the same fact restraints for making~~
stand

political action of any sort. As I under the IRS has fairly strong ideas

about this. Now this ~~same~~ ^{statement of} policy I suppose wouldn't be regarded as politics but I suppose if it went further than that ^{and} changed and became a newsletter and we really got strong on that we might go Dr. Clark: the way of the Sierra Club or some of the others that have gotten into politics.

I see the idea is

using the ASM as a lobby

Dr. Hegeman:

it seems to me ^{try to}
Well if you make a policy, and if you promulgate it and you try in a way to have a lobbyist and carrot type of approach by offering technical information ^{using it as a bribe} ^{trying to get} and at the same time somehow using the Society a policy ~~somehow~~ listened to - it seems to me that's what you're going to get.

Dr. Moulder: Well the Sierra Club hasn't been afraid of losing its IRS standing

Dr. Hegeman: They sell a lot of books and we don't - although I guess we do too.

Dr. Moulder: We should be as courageous as they have been,

Dr. Marr:

If I may I would like to comment on Dr. Dimmick's second comment ^{as} ~~before~~ I respond ^{ed} to the first. I will be blunt. I think that the ASM is being used or at least that that was the intent. It seems to be very clear from the statements we have heard today that the scientific advice that is given could be gotten and is being gotten in much greater quantity from other sources than from the ASM Advisory Committee. If that is the case and if we are being used ^{and} my suspicions, and I admit they are only suspicions, are correct, I think the only way out is to get rid of the Committee. If we want to try and develop some kind of impact on public ^{if} policy that is really desirable, and I'm not sure it is, ^{for our Society} and I have mixed feelings about this, in any event it is clear to me that we should